

Action Item

*California Postsecondary Education Commission*

Approval of the Minutes of the December 3-4, 2001, Meeting

---

---

---

# MINUTES

## *California Postsecondary Education Commission*

### Meeting of December 3-4, 2001

---

<b>Commissioners and alternates present December 3 and 4, 2001</b>	Alan S. Arkatov <i>Chair</i> Carol Chandler, <i>Vice Chair</i> William D. Campbell Irwin S. Field* Susan Hammer* Lance Izumi* Kyo Paul Thin Velma Montoya* Robert L. Moore Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.* Evonne Seron Schulze Olivia K. Singh Howard Welinsky Melinda G. Wilson**	<b>Commissioner absent</b> Odessa P. Johnson
--	--	---

(\*Present on Monday, December 3 only; \*\* present Tuesday, December 4 only)

---

<b>Call to order</b>	Commission Chair Arkatov called the Monday, December 3, 2001, California Postsecondary Education Commission meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. in the Auditorium of the Richard Riordan Central Library, 506 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California. He asked for a call of the roll.
----------------------	---

---

<b>Call of the roll</b>	Executive Secretary Judy Harder called the roll. All Commissioners were present except Johnson and Wilson. Alternate Commissioner Montoya was also present.
-------------------------	---

---

<b>Presentation of Los Angeles School District Superintendent Romer</b>	<p>Chair Arkatov introduced former Colorado Governor Roy Romer who is now Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District.</p> <p>Superintendent Romer reported on some recent activities, including having recently met with the superintendents of the 10 largest cities in the country to discuss high schools and secondary school literacy. He reviewed the outcomes of those discussions.</p> <p>Mr. Romer said a directed, structured, rigorous curriculum was put in place with the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and that 450 literacy coaches were</p>
---	--

placed in the elementary system. There is a major focus on professional development in addition to coaching for teachers to upgrade their skills. He described some of the interactive computer-based tools being used.

Student test scores in the Los Angeles Unified District, according to Mr. Romer, were evidence that changes were needed in the middle and high school cultures. The concentration on mathematics and literacy is at the core of the change. Some 20 percent of youngsters entering grades 6 – 9 are reading three to four levels below their grade level and there is a need to give them an equivalent of “Open Court,” a phonics-based concentrated program. He outlined new programs that would help achieve this goal. Additionally, he said, it is necessary to place a literacy coach in each secondary school.

Superintendent Romer noted that there are many problems with high schools, including the large size of the student bodies. He said research suggests that the ideal high school enrollment size is 700 students. He also said the high school senior year is not well utilized and it would be very creative if the academic structure and space needs could be addressed through the Commission.

Commissioner Schultz asked about any resentment from the classroom teachers as many teacher aides were replaced with coaches. Superintendent Romer said he was conscious of some resentment as he moved \$60 million out of Title 1 and into coaching. He said he sat down with many parents and asked them if they wanted their children to be able to read. He said he told them the coaches can get that job done but it would reduce the number of teacher aides.

Commissioner Izumi congratulated Governor Romer on instituting Open Court and the fact that the results have been achieved in such a short period of time. He asked what was the response of teachers to a more highly scripted type of program like Open Court, as many of the teachers who have come into the system are not familiar with direct instruction. Secondly, since many of the teachers are products of the local schools of education, he asked if work is being done with those schools to ensure that there is a greater familiarity with direct instructional methods like Open Court.

Superintendent Romer said that teachers created great resistance and they complained bitterly in the first year. He said the complaints were fewer in the second year because teachers saw that the program worked. In reference to the teaching colleges, Governor Romer declined to comment due to insufficient familiarity with the particular teaching colleges. He expressed concern about what happens when faculty ceases learning new things. He said the hallmark of the Los Angeles district is that teachers need to learn new things or they do not belong. He expressed hope to be able to work closer with the colleges responsible for teacher education.

Superintendent Romer described the protocol called “Learning Walks.” He said many principals have not been in the classroom for some time and do not understand what good instruction is; they do not know how to recognize it, and therefore they do not know how to manage toward it. Therefore, the superintendents and principals are training to do “Learning Walks.” A group of three or four walk into a class, observe for 15 minutes and then they go out into the hall to debrief. He said they look for a class-

room in which clear expectations are demonstrated, where the students understand what is expected, and the interaction between the teacher and student includes accountable talk. Through this process those who are administering schools can learn what constitutes good instruction and how to manage toward that goal.

Vice Chair Chandler asked about future changes. Superintendent Romer responded that he is working through various ideas and that he expects within the next five years to have all the high schools on multiple tracks. He said he is looking forward to the opportunity of taking many approaches, including the use of e-learning. The factor of limited available space may force some creative solutions. He said these efforts are just beginning and that hard work is under way to get something accomplished within the next six months.

Commissioner Hammer asked Superintendent Romer if he and his colleagues had discussed the concept of a school-within-a-school. He responded in the affirmative and added that the concept is the one that must be utilized because of the size of the buildings. It is a very effective concept, but there are security problems both socially and otherwise with large schools and with the kids who are not able to identify with adults in a secondary system.

Chair Arkatov thanked Superintendent Romer for his presentation.

---

**Consent calendar**

Chair Arkatov asked the Commissioners to look at the items listed in the consent calendar which he said should be moved as a single item for consideration of the Commission as a whole.

Vice Chair Chandler made a motion to adopt the consent calendar, it was seconded and approved by vote.

---

**Report of the  
Executive Director**

Chair Arkatov reported that Director Fox was recuperating from surgery and, although in some pain, he seemed to be doing well. Chair Arkatov asked Assistant Director David Leveille to give the director's report.

Deputy Director Leveille called on staff member Karl Engelbach to describe what the Commission's Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee intended to in January 2002.

Mr. Engelbach stated that the Commission's Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee would hold a special meeting in January 2002 to discuss issues relating to the budgetary matters for each of the public systems of higher education as well as the Student Aid Commission. He said the State is experiencing a significant economic slowdown in terms of revenue generation and there is a concern over the impact this may have on higher-education system budgets and hence the ability to continue to provide access and affordability to future students.

Deputy Director Leveille noted that the information provided in the director's report as part of the agenda regarding the Commission retreat was not to stimulate further discussion and debate about the issues raised and the conversations conducted on Coronado Island, but rather to provide some understanding of the types of issues discussed and

the general direction the Commission intends to take over the next few years. He briefly described four thematic areas that reflect the priorities of the Commission, as follows:

- ♦ Growth and access;
- ♦ A continuum of preparation of students K-12 through postsecondary education;
- ♦ Baccalaureate degree production; and
- ♦ Workforce preparation and economic development.

Deputy Director Leveille said the intention is for the Commission to focus on the post-secondary needs of California and to continue to interpret and be an advocate for meeting those needs for all students. He said staff will come back at the February 2002 meeting with further clarifications on a set of recommendations for Commission consideration and further the opportunity for dialogue on the Commission's strategies and themes.

Deputy Director Leveille invited staff member Kathleen Chavira to describe an issue of ongoing interest to the Commission. He indicated that the University of California Board of Regents recently adopted a comprehensive admissions policy. Ms. Chavira provided a brief update that included the following points:

- ♦ The University of California Regents approved a modified selection process for freshman admissions on November 15, 2001.
- ♦ The policy replaces the existing two-tiered process followed by campuses for many years.
- ♦ The existing two-tiered process required that 50 to 75 % of all freshman are required to be admitted based on academic criteria exclusively.
- ♦ Under the new process, the University will allow the use of all 14 selection criteria for the admission of students without the 50/70% requirement.
- ♦ The new policy will take effect for the class of the fall of 2002.

Deputy Director Leveille asked staff member Linda White to discuss the Eisenhower program and she did so briefly, saying a more detailed agenda item about the Eisenhower projects would be presented in February. She mentioned that a \$750,000 project has been funded to work with principals in the L.A. Unified School District.

Commissioner Hammer asked if the \$750,000 given to the L.A. Unified School District is in addition to the proposal by Governor Davis for an institute for 15,000 principals. Ms. White said the funding was separate and that the project funded under the Eisenhower initiative is working with the superintendents as well.

Deputy Director Leveille asked staff member Cheryl Hickey to discuss recent development as regards the Education Doctorate. Ms. Hickey said that the University of California and the State University have reached agreement on the expansion of joint doctorate programs in the field of education. Referring to the last page in Tab 3 that has the provisions of the agreement outlined, she said the most important aspect of the agree-

ment is the formation of a joint CSU/UC board that will handle much of the details of the expansion.

Ms. Hickey said there has been agreement that there will be start up funds provided by both the University and the State University systems totaling \$4 million over the next two years. The joint board will also be responsible for looking at enrollment targets that take some regional needs into consideration.

Ms. Hickey said the diplomas will carry both UC and CSU designations and students will pay UC-designated fees, with the State providing funding for the program at the higher UC-level. She said the public universities will be more active in soliciting proposals from campuses, there will be an expedited program approval process, and there will be more of a balance in terms of sharing faculty responsibilities for the students. She said that the Commission has statutory review authority for new joint programs between UC and CSU.

Commissioner Rodriguez voiced support for the UC/CSU agreement, saying he is hopeful that this approach to a joint Ed.D. will prove a better model. He said the Commission has learned that joint doctorate programs have been hit or miss in the past and, with a more formal structure such as having a board, the commitment of resources from both parties, and the commitment to not having any one segment carry the load, this could become a model for other joint programs.

Commissioner Hammer asked if a "CSU" bill would be introduced and if there was any discussion about the ability to come back in five years to see if this program is working. If not, she asked if the State University can come back and request a legislative change. Ms. Hickey stated that it is best for the Board of Trustees or the Regents to answer the question but that staff has not heard of anything at this point.

Commissioner Hammer asked who would be looking at this a few years down the road. Ms. Hickey responded that she believes it is appropriate at some time in the future for the Commission to review this process for developing joint doctorate programs to assess how it is working over time.

Deputy Director Leveille stated that this is one of the reasons why the Commission has expressed to both Chancellor Reed and President Atkinson an interest to be involved in the joint board. He said the Commission would most certainly be monitoring this activity.

Todd Greenspan, representing the University of California, stated that the idea was to create an expedited process and since the Commission does have review authority, it is appropriate to involve the Commission early on. He said the review process is one of the things that slow the degree-program approval process. The whole notion of this board is to expedite the programs, get them off the ground quickly, and put up the money in advance.

Commissioner Montoya reported that the University of California is pleased about the agreement. With regard to the faculty graduate groups, she asked if it is known what

the level of reduced teaching would be for participating California State University faculty.

Ms. Hickey said the answer is not known at this time by staff, and that it may be too early in the process to answer this question. However, Ms. Hickey speculated that the reduction might vary from program to program and campus to campus. She staff will follow this issue as it develops.

Commissioner Campbell stated that, in a very short time, there will be observable outcomes in the joint education doctorate program and it will either work or not.

---

**Recess** Chair Arkatov welcomed Velma Montoya and two new Commissioners; Robert Moore from the California Community Colleges Board of Governors and Commissioner Irwin Field representing the independent segment.

He then recessed the meeting at 2:17 p.m. in order to take a short break.

---

**Reconvene/guest presentations** Chair Arkatov reconvened the California Postsecondary Education Commission on December 3<sup>rd</sup> at 2:33 p.m. He introduced John Fairbank, senior partner of Fairbank, Maslin, and Maulin to talk about bonds, community colleges and education in California.

Mr. Fairbank discussed recent polling outcomes in California, stating that concerns about the economy and terrorism have risen dramatically over the last couple of months but that the energy crises remains the top issue of concern. Education has slipped to the third position, with 15 percent to 17 percent of people reporting education as the most important issue. He said numbers can be misleading as education and supporting education bonds is still one of the most important issues to voters.

In an overhead slide presentation, he reviewed several surveys that were taken in August and June 2001 and used to help make decisions about the statewide education bond. Some of the survey highlights were:

- ◆ 58 percent of respondents have only a fair or poor opinion on how public education is doing regarding K-12.
- ◆ Voters will support bonds that increase their taxes when they understand the need for such an increase.
- ◆ There is a much higher perception, understanding, and awareness of the need to fix local K-12 schools.
- ◆ Of the 1,000 voters polled, a ratio of almost two to one supported a bond at the \$17-billion level.
- ◆ As the bond amount goes down, support goes up slightly.
- ◆ The top reason why voters who opposed the measure did so was a belief that such money is misused, mismanaged and spent unwisely.

- ♦ Voters who are also Democrats heavily support the bond.

---

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Arkatov recessed the California Postsecondary Education Commission at 3:08 p.m. in order to convene the Education Policy and Programs Committee.
---------------	--

---

<b>Reconvene/Report of the Statutory Advisory Committee</b>	<p>Chair Arkatov reconvened the California Postsecondary Education Commission at 4:30 p.m. and asked for the report of the Statutory Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Todd Greenspan, chair of the Statutory Advisory Committee, reported that the committee had met the previous Wednesday and reviewed the meeting agenda. One of the items focused on was the Commission Legislative and Budget priority item. He referred to a statement in item 13, page three that says: “It should be State policy that there be no fee increase in excess of 10% for the year 2002-03.” He said all of the segments agree that they would like to keep fees down but they are facing an unprecedented budget situation. All options need to be on the table and a hard and fast statement that a fee increase should not be greater than a finite percentage may not be helpful at this time.</p> <p>Mr. Greenspan informed the Commission that the next phase of the regional enrollment demand study would be a regional enrollment demand study for the independent colleges and for the University of California. He suggested that it would be valuable for the Commission to withhold publication until all pieces of the study are completed. The transfer item was also discussed. He said that, while the item presents good information, transfer is a very complex topic and some of the recent segmental-level transfer achievements are not necessarily reflected.</p> <p>He said the segments reported on some current activities: (1) The independent colleges have a new articulation system up and running; (2) the California State University discussed a comprehensive evaluation of its teacher education programs; (3) the community colleges reported on some of their budget discussions and also on the fact that they are now receiving individual campus reports for Partnership for Excellence program; and (4) the University of California reported on comprehensive admissions.</p> <p>Commissioner Montoya asked Mr. Greenspan if, during the committee’s discussion on fees, whether the distinction was made between raising fees for professional school students versus undergraduates in Letters and Science. He stated that the discussion was at a general level and that concern was voiced by some committee members about the statement that there should not be a fee increase in excess of 10% without any exceptions or reference to the potential of an emergency fiscal situation.</p> <p>Karen Yelverton, representing the State University system, commented that a definitive statement of 10% under all circumstances did not leave the conversation open to all options. Staff member Karl Engelbach indicated that the Commission’s Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee is planning to hold a special meeting to discuss budget situations in January. At that meeting, it is anticipated that the systems will be asked to respond to questions regarding plans relating to student fees.</p>
---	--



Chair Arkatov added that there are other issues that have been raised, specifically the University of California's higher out-of-state graduate fees. Some believe those fees prevent recruitment of the brightest out-of-state students and should therefore be reduced.

In addition, Chair Arkatov noted the recent release of a report called *The National Survey on Student Engagement*. He said that, although it had not received much press coverage, it surveyed 155,000 students in 470 four-year colleges around the country to determine how students are learning. However, he said, the segments are not releasing the information on the individual results of that survey. He said such information could be obtained through a Freedom Of Information Act request. He requested, with concurrence of the Commission, that the Statutory Advisory Committee report back from the segments about any plans to release the actual report results.

---

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Arkatov recessed the California Postsecondary Education Commission meeting at 4:49 p.m. until the following morning.
---------------	--

---

<b>Call to order</b>	Commission Chair Arkatov called the Tuesday December 4, 2001 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 8:50 a.m. in the Fine Arts Complex of the West Los Angeles College, 9000 S. Overland Avenue, Culver City, California. He asked for a call of the roll.
----------------------	--

---

<b>Call of the roll</b>	Anna Gomez called the roll and all Commissioners were present except Field, Hammer, Izumi, Johnson, and Rodriguez. Commissioner Wilson arrived after the call of the roll.
-------------------------	--

---

<b>Welcome of guests</b>	Chair Arkatov introduced and welcomed Chancellor Mark Drummond of the Los Angeles Community College District to discuss items of interest to the Commission.
--------------------------	--

Chancellor Drummond said some 135,000 students are served by the Los Angeles Community College District. The services range broadly from language skills to knowledge about the system and country in order to gain citizenship, and includes a registered nurse program.

He discussed funding issues and the idea of *Partnerships for Excellence*. He said *Partnerships for Excellence* is a sloppy approach to outcomes-based funding because of poor measurability and design. Mr. Drummond added, however, that it is better than nothing; progress is being made with it and everyone is grateful for the funding.

Chancellor Drummond discussed the rationale for community college funding from a social-justice perspective. He said there is an implied promise of equivalency of lower division education in the Master Plan. He presented the Commission with a graphic display as a reminder to show what happened with sector funding since Prop. 13. He pointed out that 1977 – 78 Community College funding started out at \$1,500 per FT in comparison with \$7,100 per FTE in the University of California system. The 2000 –

2001 numbers show that community colleges are up to \$4,600 per FTE compared with \$25,000 per FTE for UC. He reiterated that there is a promise of parity and recommended the engagement of a very serious lower-division cost study, which, he said, should be a fully loaded cost model.

Commissioner Schultz asked what the justification is for students at UC to receive a disproportionate amount of funding compared to that received by the California Community Colleges.

Chancellor Drummond replied that the importance of research universities to the State creates a massive funding magnet. He said the community colleges in California simply never got on the train and are in a political vacuum.

Deputy Director Leveille asked what effect Proposition 98 and the community college linkage to K – 12 have on how much money the community college system is obtaining. Chancellor Drummond stated that Proposition 98 is an obvious reality. He said if Proposition 98 were left alone as it should be, and produced proceeds on an annual basis, the community colleges would have 2.7 billion additional dollars over the life of the proposition to date.

Commissioner Jhin said this message should be heard by California's governor and legislators and suggested mobilizing the 1.6 million students in the community college system as political constituents.

Commissioner Singh stated that in making inroads with the Legislature on the importance of community colleges, the emphasis of economic value to the State will be most helpful.

Chair Arkatov thanked Chancellor Drummond and introduced Frank Quiambao, interim president, West Los Angeles College.

President Quiambao welcomed the Commission and described some features of the West Los Angeles College. He outlined plans to build seven new buildings and an additional access road at the West Los Angeles campus. He said the college is working on partnerships with school districts, which include Inglewood, L.A. Unified and Culver City.

President Quiambao referred to the discussions of the possibility of the CSU system offering doctorates because the UC system is not fulfilling the need. He related the discussions to the idea that some programs at the community college level could be changed from awarding only Associate of Arts degree to awarding Baccalaureate degrees in areas which have a need that UC and CSU are not meeting. He described the Dental Hygiene and Aviation programs at West Los Angeles College and the fact that when the students graduate from such programs, there is no place in Southern California for them to get a Baccalaureate degree awarded by a public institution. He suggested that the Commission seriously look at community colleges, and where necessary, grant the opportunity for them to award Baccalaureate degrees.

---

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Arkatov recessed the Commission meeting at 9:30 a.m. in order to set up for the next information item.
---------------	--

---

<b>Reconvene/ Student transfer discussion session</b>	Chair Arkatov reconvened the Commission meeting at 9:40 am. He introduced Commission staff member ZoAnn Laurente to lead off the discussion session on student transfer.
---	--

Ms. Laurente reminded the Commission that it had participated in a panel discussion held in June 2000 with the segmental representatives on the then-recently adopted transfer agreements between and among the community colleges, UC, CSU and the Independent institutions. She said the current discussion and presentations are designed to help further advance the student-transfer discussion.

Staff member Kevin Woolfork stated that the California Higher Education Master Plan puts a premium on students' ability to transfer. Because community college students are by far the largest body of postsecondary education students, the State is challenged to facilitate the successful transfer of more students. He said a theme runs through all of the Commission's reports: there is a need for increased and improved information on student flow to be developed and shared more effectively among and between the higher education systems and policy makers.

Ms. Kate Clark, a community college faculty member, discussed the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project as well as her personal and organizational observations regarding student transfer. She said IMPAC is an intersegmental faculty-driven approach to some of the issues related to student transfer. It started in a 1996 meeting attended by faculty articulation officers and counselors. Transfer was initially looked at from a student's perspective; students were reporting that they often had to repeat courses or the content within the courses, which had the result of delaying their transfer and/or upon transfer, delaying the completion of the courses.

From the faculty perspective, students who came to UC and CSU often were underprepared to meet the demands of the work required in a given major. Most students who transfer to UC or CSU have attended two or more community colleges. Because of differences in the offerings at various community colleges, students may miss important modules and therefore have to repeat courses. She said the faculty-to-faculty resolution of transfer issues is very important, and there are things that only faculty can address. IMPAC is the exemplar of the following Commission conclusion:

The Commission concluded that while policies, programs, and services were all important components, transfer relies most significantly on person to person interaction transfer occurs in large measure because of the thoughtful personal interactions between counselors or faculty and their students, between articulation officers, and between the faculty within and between disciplines.

Ms. Clark said the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) agreed to sponsor the IMPAC project that is a cumulative, recursive, and an ongoing effort. She explained how articulation officers work with IMPAC. IMPAC works with the California Intersegmental Articulation Counsel (CIAC) to identify and recruit articulation

officers who are each assigned to a specific discipline to track its progress, to answer faculty questions, and to explain the articulation process about which most discipline faculty are woefully ignorant. She said IMPAC works with faculty and articulation officers in various regions to create and modify articulation agreements. She added that the CSU core alignment projects are not duplicative of the work of IMPAC because those projects cannot make intersegmental determinations.

Ms. Clark presented three indications of IMPAC's progress:

- ♦ The development of an engineering/physical science alternative to the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC).
- ♦ Adoption and recommendation of a module approach which identifies what are the essential modules of instruction particularly in Biology, Chemistry, and Physics.
- ♦ The introduction of an integrated Chemistry course for Nursing and other allied programs.

Jose Michel, Director of the California Articulation Numbering (CAN) system, described articulation and how the CAN program is working with colleges to provide common course numbers for lower-division courses. He explained the process in looking at course content and standards between various institutions to negotiate agreements.

Eric Taggart, director of ASSIST, provided a document to the Commissioners for reference and described the traditional articulation process as also important to student transfer. He said universities and colleges must continue to work with their traditional articulation processes to figure out comparisons and transfer information for the whole breadth of courses that students may be taking.

He said ASSIST was brought about years ago as a common place for students to obtain information on course articulation and is California's official source for course articulation information. Its charge is to represent whatever has been established an official through traditional articulation, IMPAC, CAN and any other process that deals with articulation agreement. ASSIST is funded by the Legislature through the three public systems of higher education; it has governing board with faculty, staff and system office representatives; and CPEC sits as an ex-officio member of the board. Every college and university has an official ASSIST contact as the universities do most of the data-entry work. As each university establishes its own process for articulation, it can be very confusing for students. Recommended standards for the articulation process from ICAS or some faculty-based group is desirable. It has a website at [www.assist.org](http://www.assist.org).

Commissioner Wilson asked if there was any effort to introduce ASSIST to high school seniors. Mr. Taggart reported that there are marketing plans that have been developed which contain things that are high school focused. The organization attends CSU and UC counselor conferences to which high schools are invited, and ASSIST encourages the community colleges that have 2 + 2 programs with high schools to talk about ASSIST. He said it is an important point that needs more focus.

Commission Vice Chair Chandler asked if there is a mechanism for counselors to get all of the information. Mr. Taggart said counselors use ASSIST actively and one of the responsibilities of the official ASSIST contact at every college and university is to make sure their counseling and transfer staff know about and use ASSIST correctly. Ms. Laurente added that there are a number of annual training counselors opportunities, including large conferences.

Commissioner Jhin asked if it was not the job of the counselor to ensure that students do not lose credit upon transfer and that the student takes the proper courses. Mr. Taggart stated that, if a counselor were helping a student follow the articulation agreement that was established by the university, that student would not lose any credit.

Commissioner Jhin said it is a counselor's job not to make mistakes in this area. He asked how often counselors are re-orientated to ensure that they do not make mistakes that impact students.

Mr. Woolfork stated that one of the concerns the Commission has expressed with its earlier reports is that many the opportunities for formalized interactions between counselors at community colleges and faculty at four-year systems have disappeared with the last recession and many community colleges counselors have had to take on secondary duties. Additionally, he explained that the number of counselors at colleges, as well as the formal conferences where articulation officers would meet and talk, has decreased significantly.

Commissioner Moore noted that there are many policy issues that had not come up in the discussion and asked Kate Clark to briefly advise the Commissioners on discussions relating to how transfer can be evaluated within the community college realm. She responded noting the following discussion points:

- ◆ When discussing transfer issues, it is almost exclusively regarding transfer to four-year institutions.
- ◆ The community colleges have done their own work with the National Student Clearinghouse and caught 33,000 additional transfers to other private institutions in the United States. Those numbers are very important and have not been measured in the Commission's documentation.
- ◆ While the Commission's document talks about transfer as *the* mission of the community colleges it is, in fact, only *one* of the colleges' missions.
- ◆ The Academic Senate is working with others to devise an appropriate mechanism in California Community Colleges to look at transfer rates, the notion of what constitutes a transfer rate and how to determine the rate.
- ◆ Several important elements that need to be considered when discussing transfer rates are the notions of *transfer prepared*, *transfer eligible*, *transfer capacity* and *transfer rates* as a percentage of the students that are enrolled in the other missions.

Mr. Woolfork stated that it is fully understood that the missions of all three of the public higher education systems are very broad and the discussion focuses on transfer only.

He said the Master Plan's designation of transfer is very important in facilitating student progress.

Commissioner Campbell noted that remarkable progress has occurred in the area of student transfer and asked what has happened with AA degree programs and how they figure in the discussions.

Ms. Laurente stated that getting an Associate of Arts degree as part of the transfer process is generally not the goal of the transfer student. She noted that historically, federal regulations would award financial aid to students so long as they had not yet achieved their educational goal. Receiving an AA was considered an educational goal and students would lose their financial aid; they would have to re-apply and have their eligibility re-assessed in order move on to a Baccalaureate degree. She said this is no longer the case in the federal guidelines but it has been a psychological factor that started decades ago.

Chair Arkatov asked the panelists what, in terms of evaluation, the Commission could do to bring the reality of transfer in line with expectations for the transfer process. Mr. Taggart stated that there are some very serious funding issues with ASSIST that need to be addressed if ASSIST is to retain its functionality.

---

**Presentation by  
Rick Simpson,  
Policy Director for  
the Speaker of the  
Assembly**

Chair Arkatov introduced Rick Simpson, policy director for the Speaker of the Assembly. He asked Mr. Simpson to share his thoughts on the educational bond measure including its timing and dollar amount.

Mr. Simpson stated that it appears most likely, and almost certain that the next education bond will appear on the November 2002 general election ballot. He explained that there has been some recent conversations regarding placing a portion of the education bond measure on the earlier March ballot as part of an economic stimulus package the governor has been considering. He said for a number of political and policy reasons he does not believe this will occur.

Mr. Simpson described education bond measure AB 16 and a companion measure by Senator Chesebro that went to a two-house Conference Committee at the end of last session. Also in the Conference Committee were approximately six policy bills largely related to the rules under which K-12 schools receive funding from capital outlay. He reported that when the Legislature reconvenes in January the Conference Committee would pick up where it left off. He expressed the Speaker's view as trying to have the body conclude its work product and put measures out on the floors of the two houses by the end of January 2002.

He said there seems to be strong public support for educational bonds, the public seems to be relatively insensitive to dollar amounts, but nonetheless the bond measure will require a real support campaign. He recommended giving those who will be supporting the bond measure as much time as possible to put together a campaign in order to make success more likely. He characterized the upcoming State Budget as a "large train wreck" and said it would be better if the discussion about the merits of an education bond measure was not mixed up with other issues.

When the Legislature adjourned in December, a rough consensus regarding the general architecture of bonds was reached. The bond measures for the 2002 - 2004 election cycles were before the Conference Committee and both were proposed at \$11.4 billion. Within the \$11.4 billion, the proposal was that when the conferees return, staff is going to represent that \$9.1 billion should go for K-12 and \$2.3 billion for postsecondary education in both bond measures.

He said the proposal before the conferees regarding the higher education portion of each of the measures are as follows:

- ◆ \$660 million each for UC and CSU;
- ◆ \$860 million for California Community Colleges;
- ◆ \$60 million for joint use and intersegmental facilities; and
- ◆ \$60 million for new and off center campuses.

Mr. Simpson related that there seems to be a fairly strong sentiment in both houses of the Legislature and the Governor's Office to tilt the distribution of the capital outlay funding disproportionately in the direction of the community colleges.

It was noted that the Commission has interest in providing some funding for joint use or intersegmental kinds of facilities on a set-aside or policy bases. Mr. Simpson said this was something that will be proposed at the staff level to the Conference Committee members when they return, and it is also an issue that has captured interest at the K-12 level.

Chair Arkatov asked Mr. Simpson to help the Commission with the formalization of the joint-use document, as there are no formal joint-use blueprints. He asked how a formalized joint-use blueprint could be integrated into the bond measure.

Mr. Simpson responded that the Commission has already started the process as Commission staff provided draft language for a bond measure. He said some overarching bodies like the Commission should develop some criteria for the categories of students and the kinds of programs served by the joint-use component.

Commissioner Moore suggested that there are some models that could provide a basis for some language. The San Francisco Community College District partnership with local universities, which is in the midst of constructing facilities for their joint use, was exemplified. He suggested looking at some programs that have worked to possibly ease the way towards providing acceptable language. He recommended a provision for input from the segments.

Chair Arkatov asked Mr. Simpson to share his thoughts on student fees. Mr. Simpson responded that the upcoming budget, on a percentage basis, will not be as bad as the 1991-1992 budget, nevertheless an increase in student fees offset by appropriate student financial aid will be a likely option.

Deputy Director Leveille thanked Mr. Simpson for his willingness to join with staff and for providing his remarks. He said staff has been working diligently to advance some of

the Commission's interests as it relates to the bond measure. He reminded the Commission that the joint facilities notion is not new and that the California Community Colleges and the State University have been engaged in such activity for at least 25 years. He informed the Commission that it is the intention of staff to provide a series of recommendations that relate to the guidelines for new campuses at the February Commission meeting.

---

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Arkatov recessed the Commission meeting at 11:35 am in order to convene the Governmental Relations Committee.
---------------	---

---

<b>Reconvene/Report of the Nominating Committee, Melinda Wilson, Chair</b>	<p>Chair Arkatov reconvened the California Postsecondary Education Commission at 11:50 a.m. He asked Commissioner Wilson to report on the Nominating Committee slate of officers for 2002.</p> <p>Committee Chair Wilson reported that, at the October Commission meeting, the nominating committee, consisting of Commissioners Welinsky, Rodriguez, and herself, recommended a slate of officers for 2002. To that slate, she proposed an amendment to substitute Commissioner Robert L. Moore as vice chair of the Governmental Relations Committee in place of former Commissioner Phillip Forhan. She stated that Commissioner Moore would also like to be member of the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee and asked Chair Arkatov to take this into consideration. Chair Wilson made a motion to approve the recommended slate of officers, as revised, and it was seconded and approved by vote.</p>
--	--

---

<b>Revision of Commission Meeting Dates for 2002 and proposed dates for 2003.</b>	<p>Chair Arkatov recommended the February 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> 2002 meeting dates scheduled for Los Angeles be changed to Sacramento. In addition, he suggested that the April, June and July meetings in 2002 also occur in Sacramento, with the December meeting possibly being in San Francisco.</p> <p>Commissioner Chandler explained that it has been very valuable to have "on-site" meetings and suggested that Commissioners take the opportunity to visit campus sites in their areas, interact with local administrators, and to bring back information to the Commission.</p> <p>Commissioner Schultz said the budget crunch is the reason she was concerned with conducting meetings across the state. The Commission needs to keep expenses down and conducting meetings in Sacramento to do this. She noted that many staff members receive no additional compensation for the extra work they put in while on travel. Therefore, having meetings in Sacramento is also a way to reward staff. She commended staff for their hard work and patience. Commissioners who have the time will be more than willing to go to the offices of the elected officials that need to hear from the Commissioners themselves for the purpose of achieving a greater impact.</p> <p>A motion was made to accept the new meeting schedule, as revised, and it was seconded and approved without dissent.</p>
---	--



<b>Report of the Governmental Relations Committee</b>	Committee Chair Welinsky offered the approval of the revised matrix of State legislation as a motion. It was seconded and approved.
<b>Report of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee</b>	Committee Chair Jhin said the Commission has received the report on <i>Regional Higher Education Enrollment Demand Study</i> and that the Committee had approved that report. He made a motion to adopt the report; it was seconded and approved without dissent.
<b>Report of the Executive Committee</b>	Chair Arkatov said a meeting was held November 2 <sup>nd</sup> regarding ongoing personnel and organizational issues with the director. A motion was made to postpone the Committee on Education Code Section 66905 discussion until the next meeting when Director Fox could attend. It was seconded and approved to postpone the discussion.
<b>Other business</b>	<p>Chair Arkatov stated that part of the hope for the meeting at West L.A. Community College was to highlight that it is a truly important regional component. He asked Commissioner Moore to share some closing thoughts.</p> <p>Commissioner Moore gave a brief presentation based on his perspective as a Board of Governors member and as Chair of the Board of Governors Fiscal Committee, on the driving issues within the community colleges. Last year, he said, the Board of Governors set an agenda with six priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Working on the Budget.</li> <li>♦ Producing a public awareness marketing campaign.</li> <li>♦ Human resources, faculty development and greater diversity amongst faculty and administrators.</li> <li>♦ Workforce development.</li> <li>♦ Master Plan.</li> <li>♦ Performance monitoring and accountability.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioner Moore said progress was made in all the priority areas and that issues raised in Chancellor Drummond's presentation on the funding will continue to come before the Commission. He said a group has been formed within the Chancellor's Office to discuss funding of community colleges concerning what it really will take to accomplish these various missions. He described the prevailing concept that says, "If you are going to give more to one segment, then you have to take something from somebody else." He said that he believes there is a dynamic building in the State, particularly within the community college arena, to break out of that box.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	Having no further business, Chair Arkatov adjourned the meeting at 12:12 p.m.

